

Applicant: Bill J. Coe
Serial No. 09/879,419
May 25, 2004

REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated February 25, 2004. In that Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings and rejected claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 1-7, 10-12, 17, 18 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Calthrop in view of Peterson. Claims 1, 8-10, 13, 14, 17, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Booth in view of Snyder and Peterson. Claims 15, 16 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Calthrop in view of Peterson and further in view of Dennington. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's objections and rejections and offers the foregoing amendments and following remarks in support thereof.

Claims 1, 10 and 17 have been amended to overcome the Examiner's Section 112, second paragraph rejection.

Claims 1-24 remain pending in the Application.

Claims 1-7, 10-12, 17, 18 and 22-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Calthrop in view of Peterson. Applicant respectfully submits that there is absolutely no motivation to combine these two references. As previously argued by Applicant, Calthrop is directed to a specially designed safety spring sling, which includes an extensible member that acts as a shock absorbing device. The suspension lines are

Applicant: Bill J. Coe
Serial No. 09/879,419
May 25, 2004

directly connected to safety hook 4 and the harness is directly connected to safety hook 5. Accordingly, the entire teaching and purpose of Calthrop is contained within the portion that the Examiner is eliminating by the proposed substitution with the Peterson structure. Thus, the proposed combination destroys the entire teaching of the Calthrop reference and is improper. There is no shock absorbing device left with the Examiner's proposed combination. Applicant also incorporates by reference its other previous arguments regarding the Calthrop and Peterson references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-7, 10-12, 17, 18 and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Calthrop in view of Peterson.

Claims 1, 8-10, 13, 14, 17, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Booth in view of Snyder and Peterson. The invention in Booth is not directed to the attachment of the bridle cord to the pilot chute and canopy. Rather, Booth provides a complicated structure to deploy the main chute by the pilot chute. Applicant also again respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's statement that Snyder discloses a parachute having a bridle cord. A "bridle cord" is a line that connects a pilot chute to the canopy. Snyder has nothing to do with bridle cords. Rather, Snyder teaches of a canopy design that eliminates the bottom sheet for better glide efficiency and reduced bulk.

Applicant: Bill J. Coe
Serial No. 09/879,419
May 25, 2004

Thus, there is absolutely no motivation in Booth, Snyder or Peterson for the Examiner's proposed modifications. Applicant also incorporates by reference its above remarks regarding the Peterson reference and its previous remarks regarding the Booth, Snyder and Peterson references from prior Amendments for this Application. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1, 8-10, 13, 14, 17, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Booth in view of Snyder and Peterson.

Claims 15, 16 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Calthrop in view of Peterson and further in view of Dennington. Dennington fails to correct the deficiencies of Calthrop and Peterson noted above. Providing Peterson's recyclable plastic jug strap in nylon, still fails to providing any motivation for substantially modifying the Calthrop reference and destroying the teachings of the Calthrop reference. Thus, there is absolutely no motivation, teaching or suggestion for any of the Examiner's proposed combinations. Applicant also respectfully incorporates by reference its previous remarks regarding the Dennington reference made in prior amendments for this application including, but not limited to, the fact that Applicant respectfully submits that the Dennington reference is non-analogous art and not a proper Section 103 reference. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of

Applicant: Bill J. Coe
Serial No. 09/879,419
May 25, 2004

claims 15, 16 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Calthrop in view of Peterson and further in view of Dennington.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's objections to the drawings. Applicant respectfully submits that new matter is not introduced by the proposed drawings. The figures merely provide conventional devices known by those skilled in the art of parachute manufacturing. The circular element next to element 110 in Figures 16 and 17 are believed to be conventional rings and do not form part of the claimed invention. If the Examiner would prefer that the circular elements be removed to overcome the drawing objection, Applicant will make appropriate revisions to the drawings.

Applicant has completely responded to the Office Action dated February 25, 2004. Favorable action is respectfully requested.

If there are any additional charges, including extension of time, please bill our Deposit Account No. 13-1130.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel S. Polley, Reg. No. 34,902
Dale Paul DiMaggio, Reg. No. 31,823
MALIN, HALEY & DIMAGGIO, P.A.
CUSTOMER No. 22235
1936 South Andrews Ave.
Ft. Lauderdale, Florida 33316
Tel: (954) 763-3303